

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **April 14, 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-9, 12-13, 15-16, 19-20 and 22-24. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-9, 12-13, 15-16, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Drost et al. (USPN 6,472,931, hereinafter “Drost”). Claims 22-24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being anticipated by Drost.


Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to include allowable limitations from dependent claims 22, 23, and 24, respectively. Dependent claims 22-24 have been canceled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2 and 5-6, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9 and 12-13, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 16 and 19-20, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 31 May 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665